

REMARKS

Claims 1, 8, 14-17, 19-30, 32, and 33 were pending. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended. Amendments to the claims are supported by at least FIG. 7 and the related description. Claims 1, 8, 14-17, 19-30, 32, and 33 accordingly remain pending in the application.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 8, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22, 25, 26, 32 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,826,166 (hereinafter “Brooks”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,335 (hereinafter “Gordon”). Claims 15, 23, 24, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks, in view of Gordon, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,903,262 (hereinafter “Ichihashi”). Claims 19 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks, in view of Gordon, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0221307 (hereinafter “Arai”). Finally, claims 20, 28, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks, in view of Gordon, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,790,173 (hereinafter “Strauss”). Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections. Nevertheless, in order to expedite allowance of the present application, Applicant has amended the claims for clarification purposes. Reconsideration in view of the following discussion is requested.

Claim 1 recites a combination of features including:

“performing a test on a bouquet service list in response to detecting said navigation event, wherein said test comprises determining whether surfer linkage is provided;
if no surfer linkage is provided and no surf track is found, displaying no surfer application.”

In the present Office Action, Arai is generally cited for features related to those of claim 19 and the recited bouquet association tables (BAT). However, Applicant has reviewed Arai, as well as the remaining cited art, and finds no disclosure or suggestion of the above recited features. Accordingly, the combination of cited art does not disclose all the features of claim 1 and claim 1 is patentably distinguishable for at least these reasons. As claim 8 includes features similar to those discussed above, claim 8 is patentably distinguishable for at least these reasons as well.

Should the examiner believe a telephone interview would facilitate prosecution, such an interview is requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such an extension. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5266-05900/RDR.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Rory D. Rankin /

Rory D. Rankin

Reg. No. 47,884

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin,
Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: October 8, 2009